DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 856 SO 010 219

AUTHOR Harkness, Albert, Jr.
TITLE Governmental Objectives in Exchanges of Persons Programs.
INSTITUTION Tufts Univ., Medford, Mass. Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy.
PUB DATE Mar 77
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the International Society for Educational, Cultural and Scientific Interchanges (Saint Louis, Missouri, March 16-20, 1977)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Change; Administrative Organization; Cultural Activities; Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Exchange; Cultural Interrelationships; Data Analysis; Developing Nations; Evaluation; *Exchange Programs; Global Approach; *Government Role; Intercultural Programs; *Objectives; *Policy Formation; Program Administration; Program Evaluation; Resource Allocations

ABSTRACT

The paper questions whether educational and cultural activities sponsored by the United States government should be aimed at foreign policy objectives or should be treated as ends in themselves. Arguments are presented by political leaders, educators, and government officials in favor of and against cultural exchange as a form of foreign policy propaganda. Exchanges between the United States and pluralistic, industrialized societies are compared with exchanges with less developed countries and with societies where an adversary political climate exists. The most effective type of exchange with industrialized nations such as Great Britain are Selected Leader Grants, which allow foreign political leaders to visit the United States. In developing nations, exchanges which strengthen the educational and cultural infrastructure of the recipient country have been most successful. Exchanges with adversary countries are the most difficult to organize, classify, and evaluate. Most exchanges with a totalitarian society are on a government-to-government basis, but there have been private exchanges of art treasures and sporting events between the United States and communist countries. The conclusion is that academic, artistic, and athletic exchanges should be directed by the same governmental agency, be part of a total foreign policy, and exhibit long range rather than immediate political, tactical purposes. (Author/DB)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED144856

OCT 31 1977

Governmental Objectives in Exchanges of Persons Programs

by Albert Harkness, Jr.

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY
"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Albert Harkness, Jr.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

In 1964 Philip Coombs, who had previously been the first Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, aske

> "Should educational and cultural activities--at lea sponsored or supported by the federal government--be con aimed at foreign policy objectives? Or should they be t. ends in themselves, best divorced from foreigh policy?"
>
> "How should government and private efforts be related?"
>
> "What is government's proper role, given the fact that m society's educational and cultural resources lie outside government and beyond its direct control?"
>
> (Philip H. Coombs: The F of Foreign Policy: Educational and Cultural Affairs, Harper & Row, 1964, pp. 23-4.)

To find an answer to the last two questions, he and his Deputy, Saxton Bradford had tried vainly to collect information on the cultural and exchange activities abroad of American foundation, universities, churches, labor unions and so forth. They were right in assuming that the private activities were the tail that wagged the dog but the programs were so diverse and variously motivated and funded that even restricting themselves to one field (education) in one country (Mexico) as a pilot project, they were unable to develop a usable model for policy purposes.

For those of us who observed and participated in the painful process, one lesson did emerge. It became clear that, at least in a society where exchanges are easily carried out without host government interference, cultural officers charged with official exchanges had better spend at least as much time informing themselves of private activities and their sometimes exogenous effects, as on their own programs. Indeed the objectives and patterns of the government's program would probably have to be tailored in a given country to conditions cosiderably effected by private American programs. It might be incidentally noted that governmental information

SP 010 219

programs are similarly affected by the vast flow abroad of the American media. Thus both governmental cultural and information programs often have the objective of trying to bring into balance the image of the United States in a given country where distortions may have been created by private means. Of course, one should remember that these are distortions according to the government officers and not necessarily to the private Americans who knowingly or unknowingly created them.

However small the government's exchange program in relation to those of private entities, it is nevertheless important. It has been pointed out that "The comparatively modest size of the State Department's program is misleading. It is highly selective. It is apportioned by countries according to political judgments. It is carefully programmed. Its balance between the immediate and ultimate objectives is calculated" (James M. Davis: "Governmental Policy and International Education: United States of America", in Stewart Fraser (ed.): Governmental Policy and International Education, John Wiley & Sons, 1965, p. 215, emphasis mine).

Where the United States is operating in more or less open societies in the more or less free world the answers one makes to Coombs' second and third questions will have a direct bearing on one's answer to the first, and for the purposes of this paper, core question. I suspect that, by and large, the academic community would come down hard in favor of "educational and cultural activities...as ends in themselves" while government officials, with the exception of some of those directly involved in exchanges, would hope that they would be "aimed at foreign policy objectives".

Fortunately, there is a good deal of leeway for those of us who don't like to give catagorical answers, between 'foreign policy' and 'foreign

policy objectives'. In fact there is a good deal of flexibility in the definition of foreign policy itself. One who might oppose an exchange designed to buy a foreign official might condone an exchange to stress our accomplishments in the arts. The first is certainly not divorced from foreign policy but the second must admit a long term foreign policy objective.

The Exchange of Persons Program as described by law has as its objective "to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries...to promote international cooperation for educational and cultural advancement; and thus to assist in the development of friendly, sympathetic, and peaceful relations between the United States and other countries of the world." (Fulbright-Hays Act as quoted by Commbs, p. 51). It is arguable that increased understanding will necessarily promote peaceful relations. Quarreling husbands and wives usually understand each other all too well as do the Arabs and Israelis. But it is not arguable that the "development of friendly, sympathetic relations between the United States and the other countries of the world" is not a foreign policy objective. Senator Fulbright, the father of our cultural relations legislation opposed the use of cultural relations a "propaganda" (whatever he meant by that), but he certainly considered it married to rather than divorced from foreign policy. In fact in his introduction to Coombs' book he said: "Educational exchange is not merely a laudable experiment, but a positive instrument of foreign policy, designed to mobilize human resources just as military and economic policies seek to mobilize physical resources." (p. xi). In fact Coombs himself, in the very title of his book admits that the objective of governmental programs is obvious: The Fourth Dimension of Foreign Policy. And another strong advocate of the cultural approach, Charles Frankel, who followed Coombs as Assistant Secretary, entitled his book: The Neglected Aspect of

Foreign Affairs, (Brookings, 1965).

It seems to me therefore, that the question is not whether or not cultural and personal exchanges should be directed at foreign policy objectives or not but rather to what degree and in what time frame. Although there may be some, relatively few members of congressional constituencies, I suspect, who believe that the government should conduct international cultural relations for culture's sake, the majority want a dividend for their investment. The question then is: should it be a long term or a short term dividend.

Different kinds of exchanges tend to lend themselves to different objectives and exchanges operating in different kinds of societies will have different results. It would seem useful therefore briefly to discuss government exchanges in the principle types of societies in which they are conducted, identify which kinds of exchanges are possible and what objectives they are aimed at. I shall mention first the pluralistic societies of the industrialized world, then the lesser developed countries, or LDCs, and finally those societies where an adversary climate exists, more or less closed societies of either the right or the left. Of course this is an extremely arbitrary division and one that gets badly blurred at the edges. For example, where do you put Brazil? But it should serve the purpose of illustrating the extent of variables which make up the overall exchange picture.

Perhaps the most popular exchanges among many scholars and certainly the most difficult to justify at budget time are those with friendly and highly developed countries which differ from our own kind of society much less than the other categories. With Great Britain, for example, the United States government can conduct any kind of exchange it wishes and

it always receives a very high order of applicants for each opportunity. On the other hand, private American exchanges with Great Britain are conducted on many levels. Tourists, entertainers, businessmen, scientists. Rhodes scholars; you name it. Furthermore, the cultural differential between our two societies is relatively so small that there is comparatively little danger of distorted images and damaging stereotypes.

Why then, should the taxpayer be asked to support further exchanges? A good many people feel that we should not and I tend to agree with them with one important caveat. For even in societies as similar as Great Britain and the United States perceptual differences can develop and often, when the do, because of our very similarities, misunderstandings can become serious. One need only remind oneself of the Suez crisis of 1956. But what can government exchanges do to correct or at least soften such misunderstandings?

I believe that this is the area in which the carefully selected Leader grant can play its most effective role. Although the leader grant can be used in a number of ways, by its very nature it is the most susceptible to direct policy support of any of the exchange mechanisms. The selection is, I believe, always done by the Embassy, often by the ambassador himself, and never by a binational commission or academic entity. It is tailored to the individual recipient and the program is carried out in a manner calculated to flatter the grantee. It lends itself ideally to the short term, two or three month visit, by a leading editor, educator, labor leader, rising politician, or even minister of state. During the visit the grantee can meet important people in the United States who are in the same field or in fields of interest to him. If the selection, timing and programming are properly handled, it can be the most persuasive, in the short term, political sense of any of the exchange mechanisms.

It is hard to think of any other types of exchanges by the government which are really justifiable from a taxpayer's point of view with nations, such as Great Britain, where our values are generally similar and private exchanges are doing the job better than the government can.

In the lesser developed countries, however, the situation is entirely different. During the fifties and sixties a great deal of attention was given to strengthening democracies against the threat of international communism. This often took the form of trying to strengthen the educational and cultural infrastructure of developing nations. AID of course played the leading role in this but the State Department's exchange of persons program contributed importantly. It has always seemed to me that our effort to make over entirely different societies with entirely different histories in our own image, has been the main fallacy of the diffusion model, to which the failure of the Alliance for Progress in Latin America testifies as tragic witness. Nevertheless, while we have seldom wrought changes we could have wished, we have wrought changes. Some understanding of what these changes have been should give us a better idea of the potential of exchanges and give us some guidance for using them for our own objectives in the future.

In talking of the LDCs we are of course dealing with a very wide spectrum running from Argentina to Zambia. But they do have certain things in common which gives some logic to lumping them together. Most of them are former colonies; most of them lack the economic and social infrastructure to make them truly competitive in the arena of world powers; and many of them have been actual or are potential pawns in the competition of the superpowers.

As former colonies, they tend to have a love-hate relationship with

their former overlords and the elites in many of these countries are educated in the metropole and use its language. Massive exchanges of this kind are taking place all the time, for example, between France and Francophone Africa. At the same time the super powers have tried to recruit these same ethnic and linguistic groups. Lumumba University in Moscow and the cultural efforts of USIA in Paris ~~to~~ to recruit future African leaders while they are students in France are examples.

Although a certain amount of private money does go into exchanges between the United States and the LDCs, it seems to me that there is a large and legitimate role for the government to play. There are some tourists and some businessmen and some privately funded academic exchanges. While it would be wrong to condemn the tourists and the businessmen out of hand as transmitters of unfavorable images, it must be admitted that, certainly in combination with the flow of the American media, TV soaps, advertising, wire services, etc. the picture the LDCs have of our society is often quite one sided. In those countries where the cultural differential between our two societies is extreme, these distorted "pictures in our heads" as Walter Lippmann called them, can have serious consequences. One need only recall current efforts of the LDCs in UNESCO to "balance" the flow of information.

The privately funded academic exchanges are undoubtedly contributing to a more balanced image as are such excellent junior exchanges as the Experiment in International Living and the American Field Service. But all these activities have their own specific objectives, which while usually and incidentally supportive of the governments' objectives, are not planned as a corrective for distorted stereotypes.

This of course, is where the government must come in. If our relations with the Third World are going to become as vital as seems to be the case,

government sponsored exchanges with the LDCs should be maintained at a high level in almost all catagories: leaders, specialists, Fulbrighters, students, and the rest. Of course, with the relative status of the LDCs varying as much as ~~they~~ do, certain catagories will be more suitable in some of them than in others. For example, we can find more candidates for graduate study in political science from Peru than from Camaroon. It will also be harder to recruit American professors and graduate students to go to some countries where the academic infrastructure is primitive and the opportunities for research are limited.

But undoubtedly the greatest difficulty in conducting exchanges with the LDCs is the suspicion in which the great powers are held by many of their elites. In Latin America Yankeephobia is an old habit dating from Ariel, Panama and the Big Stick. But in the newer countries of the Third or less developed World, it has only recently become modish to hate the United States. The antagonisms toward the old colonial powers have only lately been redirected against the new 'imperialists', that is to say the super powers, the Soviet Union and the United States. I would guess that the citizens of a country more or less directly under the shadow of one of the super-powers would look with more favor at the other super-power. I doubt that quantitative proof of this would be difficult to obtain. Thus, the citizens of Eastern European countries could be supposed to want freedom from the domination of the USSR, and the citizens of say, Peru would seek less dependence on the USA.

While a great many of the LDCs consider themselves members of the Third World, a third force dependent on neither of the super-powers, in fact, most of them are dependent on us. The LDCs within the communist orbit have no doubts about where they stand. It is the countries of the middle east, South East Asia, Africa and so forth which have ambivalent

feelings about their loyalties. But most of them exist in the dollar orbit and the orbit of American power, despite Cuba and Vietnam.

The love-hate feeling of many of the LDCs for the United States, obviously creates difficulties for us in our relations. At the same time there are some opportunities also in this situation. In general, the LDCs want modern know-how and realize that the United States is the best place to get it. Because of nationalistic suspicions, AID programs and other types of overt technical assistance are often not possible. But exchanges under the Department's 'cultural' program usually are. The vast number of students from the LDCs, many of them on State Department grants in the United States is an encouraging augury for our future relations with the LDCs. Indeed the student program may well be the most effective instrument we have in our relations with the LDCs. Granted, this is a long term investment, but probably a very good one. Other exchange activities are probably less useful in these countries. We have some leader grants, some American specialists and so forth. But it is the foreign students in the United States which will have the greatest impact on our long term relations.

The last large category is made up of those countries with which have more or less adversary relationships. Here the gamut runs from states with which we have virtually no relationship at all, such as Cuba, to authoritarian governments of the right, which while officially friendly to the United States, share little of our nation's values. In a case such as Cuba, there is little that can be done through exchanges although it should be remembered that the first cracks in the curtain with the Soviet Union came with cultural activities. Perhaps some day soon the same will happen with Cuba after formal diplomatic relations have been renewed. We shall return to the Soviet Union and other countries behind the Iron Curtain

presently. First we should explore the role of exchanges in authoritarian states of the right.

In a country such as Venezuela under Perez Jimenez, where I served many years ago as cultural attache, the official climate was one of friendship and there was a good deal of friendly private inter-change between Americans and Venezuelans in various walks of life. But there was great animosity felt by the intellectual elites of Venezuela for the government of the United States. Since they were convinced that it was our policy which kept the dictator in power, this was not so strange.

In such a climate, it was hard to find an intellectual, using the word in its loosest Latin American sense, who would be seen at the American Embassy or would accept invitations to the United States. To do so would be "vendido a los Yankees". Of course we did find some, either those who identified with the regime or those, to whom the benefits of study in the United States outweighed the scorn of being labeled 'sold to the Yankees'. But a majority of those left of center professors, lawyers and writers who would (and in fact did) become important under a subsequent democratic regime, were not available as contacts for the traditional diplomatists. This was due partly to their distaste for U.S. policy and partly through our caution.

In my opinion this offered a classic case of the proper role of cultural diplomacy. While the leftist or left of center intellectuals were closed to the traditional diplomatists, closed as a target group to our own leader program, and only partially open to the foreign student program, they were fairly easily reached by American specialists in Venezuela as well as cultural affairs officers in the Embassy. Despite the fear in the Embassy proper of Senator McCarthy and despite the distast the intellectuals felt for U.S. policy, we were able to make contact with some of them as professors and intellectuals rather than as dissident politicians.

One of them was law professor Rafael Caldera who later became President of Venezuela. Thus cultural diplomacy in general and exchanges of American professors in particular can form a bridge to the future which is not open to political officers hemmed in by bureaucratic and other restraints.

It would be foolish to ascribe too much to exchanges of students and professors. But if one includes in cultural diplomacy and personal exchanges such activities as sports events, cultural presentations and even artistic events, one has pretty much covered the area of effective contacts possible in this kind of society. Our diplomatic fear of treading on the toes of the regime to which we are accredited has always created a problem for us when the regime changes. Witness Franco in Spain, the colonels in Greece and so on. Although the circumstances were very different, I cannot help recalling that when the labor party took over from the conservatives in Great Britain some years ago, our labor attache was the only one in the Embassy to have contact in the new government.

The adversary relatinship that is most sensitive from the point of view of world peace, is, of course, the confrontation of the United States and the communist world. Although in the early days of the Cold War we were dealing with a monolithic structure directed by the Soviet Union, this relationship has now become much more complicated in a multipolar world with deviations in Eastern Europe and an almost triangular arrangement between the U.S. the USSR and China. From the point of view of exchanges, the wavering path of detente has maintained the USSR as the principal arena of our efforts behind the iron and bamboo curtains. From an uncertain beginning in the late fifties to the present time these exchanges have been gradually increasing in number and in kind.

It would seem that exchanges with a totalitarian society would have to be exclusively government to government. But from the Soviet point of

view this need not necessarily be the case. Using the specious argument that their athletes are amateurs and their museums autonomous, they have tried to deal directly with private entities in the United States. Some scientific exchanges of persons have been similarly conducted. This has created a very difficult problem for the American government which cannot control our private organizations as the Soviets can their 'autonomous' entities.

In the exchange of art exhibits, for example, the Russians have dealt when they could with American Museums and bypassed the U.S. government. Since exchanges have taken place, it would seem academic that the government had no role. But in fact, the objectives of the government and of private museums, and consequently their results, are quite different. It has been our government's purpose to expose the elites of the Soviet Union to as much of the variety and experimentation in modern American art as possible. However, the USSR has tried to limit access of her people to representational art which does not seem very different from what is tolerated in the Soviet Union. Since the American museums are interested in showing their audiences the rare and hitherto inaccessible treasures of Russia's art, they are willing to send to Moscow what the USSR wants regardless of the U.S. government's objectives. (I am indebted to Miss Cindy Fox, of the Fletcher School who is writing her Ph.D thesis on this subject for this information and analysis). In this respect, it would seem that the government's role in exchanges should be insisted upon.

On the other hand, there have been instances in the exchanges history with the Soviet Union where the U.S. government has reacted to international events such as the invasion of Chekoslovakia, by cutting off or slowing down exchanges. Many observers feel that this use of cultural affairs as

a signaling devise in short range political situations defeats the main long range objective of this diplomatic tool by curtailing the cultural contacts between the United States and the over-sheltered people of Russia. (Miss Fox's Thesis) In this kind of a situation, perhaps, the private sector should have more to say.

In the actual exchange of persons field, as opposed to the exchange of art objects, the major activity between the two super-powers has been in the performing arts and sports. Here the government has had to play the central role of negotiator, and in the field of performing arts has had to act as angel since our expensive artistic groups, such as a symphony orchestra cannot perform profitably in the Soviet Union while the Bolshoi, for example, makes a good dollar profit for the Russians performing in this country.

The exchanges of sports has recently become extensive and will certainly be center stage for the forthcoming Olympics in Moscow. While it is popularly assumed that young people from different societies playing together is generally a good thing, there is some doubt that adversary sports competitions really engender brotherhood. There is relatively little opportunity for contact among players of the two countries off the playing field, and on it, the contact is not always of too gentlemanly a sort. Take for example the hockey match between a Russian Army team and the Philadelphia Flyers last year in which the roughness of the American team shocked anyone with a sense of sportsmanship. This of course is not to say that instances equally unpleasant could not be found on the other side

The forthcoming Olympic games will bring a new dimension to exchanges between the Russians and the rest of the world, particularly the United States. In this situation the role of the U.S. government will be minimal and we may be in for some trouble which could set back more routine exchanges

in which the government has a legitimate and important role.

The exchanges will involve not only athletic teams, but tourists, all kinds of support personnel, and by no means least, the American media. The television network which contracts with the Soviet authorities will have to work under conditions it has never had to put up with before. But the commercial and technical difficulties may be as nothing compared to the substantive problems of transmitting what it believes to be news from an international forum taking place in a closed society.

It was only a few months ago that the Soviet delegation to the UNESCO meeting in Nairobi proposed that "states are responsible for the activities in the international sphere of all mass media under their jurisdiction." Apart from the threat such sentiments imply for freedom of the press in the third world, one must consider the disastrous implications of this attitude if applied to the flow of information from Moscow during the Olympics. Having seen the disappointment felt by the Mexicans in 1968 when our media sent back only sensational and sporting news and largely ignored the impressive cultural activities put on at great expense by the Mexicans, it is easy to sympathize with the desire of the hosts to insist on 'balanced' news. But the free world media will resist being told what the correct balance is, and if there is no flow of information, the games might just as well not take place.

It is hard to see how the government can help in this situation. It is one of those areas where there should be a role for the government but, in fact, all it can do is negotiate and hope for the best.

In conclusion, what answers can we give to Philip Coombs' questions? It is clear that none of the answers will be simple and straightforward. They will differ in different circumstances and different kinds of relationships.

For example, we can say categorically that exchanges should be directed at foreign policy objectives, but in general we would insist that they be long range rather than immediate political, tactical purposes. On the other hand there will be occasions when the Leader grant program can play a tactical role to influence a particular writer, politician, economist on a specific issue.

The vast amount of information which comes into many countries of the world from the media, private exchanges, and so forth, relegate the role of government pretty much to trying to balance the projection of images, to compensate for over emphasis on Coca Cola, crime or sex or just materialism, and facilitate exchanges by the private sector. But, of course there are societies which do not receive much information about us except what their own propagandists give them and what leaks through the curtain on external government radio, occasional exchanges, etc. Here the Government has a primary role and where the private sector has gotten into the act as in sports and museum exchanges, something desirable has been lost.

Finally then, the key question and the hardest one to answer is the proper relation between the private and the public sector in exchanges. There is the facilitative function by the government in those areas where exchanges are frequent; there is the balancing function where images get distorted; there is the negotiating function when dealing with closed societies; and there is the supplementary function in those societies of potential importance to us where private exchanges will not take place without encouragement.

To permit the government to carry out these legitimate functions in the exchange field it will be essential to have the proper bureaucratic structure in Washington. For too long we have muddled through with the

artificial separation of cultural affairs direction in the Department's Bureau of Cultural Affairs from implementation by USIS officers in our embassies abroad. Whatever the Carter Administration buys from the Stanton Report or from the various rebuttals offered from in and out of government, the new President, in implementing his promised restructuring of overseas information activities, should keep all cultural activities in the same organization. Cultural exchanges, whether they be academic, artistic or athletic should be directed and implemented by the same team. With new players on the stage in Washington, the ideal time for re-organization has come.

Albert Harkness, Jr.
The Fletcher School of
Law and Diplomacy